

**CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY LETTER REPORT –
NEGATIVE FINDINGS**

Perris Valley Industrial Project

Lead Agency:

**City of Perris
Development Services Department
Planning Division
135 North D Street
Perris, CA 92570-2200**

Preparer:

**Donna Beddow, RPA, and Robert Bolger, RPA
Harris & Associates
600 B Street, Suite 2000
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 236-1778**

Project Proponent:

**CH Realty – IX-MC I Riverside Perris Airport, L.P., a Delaware Limited Partnership
Mike Masterson
Phil Cyburt
18032 Lemon Drive, Suite 367
Yorba Linda, CA 92886**

May 2024

National Archaeological Data Base Information

Authors: Donna Beddow and Robert Bolger

Firm: Harris & Associates
600 B Street, Suite 2000
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 236-1778

Client/Project Proponent: CH Realty – IX-MC I Riverside Perris Airport, L.P., A Delaware Limited Partnership
Mike Masterson
Phil Cyburt
18032 Lemon Drive, Suite 367
Yorba Linda, CA 92886

Report Date: May 2024

Report Title: Cultural Resources Survey Report – Negative Findings for the Perris Valley Industrial Project

Type of Study: Intensive Pedestrian/Phase I

New Sites: None

Updated Sites: None

USGS Quad: Perris

Acreage: 87.43

Key Words: Perris USGS Quad, Luiseño Traditional Use Area, Negative Survey

May 2024

CH Realty – IX-MC I Riverside Perris Airport, L.P., A Delaware Limited Partnership
Mike Masterson
Phil Cyburt
18032 Lemon Drive, Suite 367
Yorba Linda, CA 92886

RE: Cultural Resources – Negative Findings; Perris Valley Industrial Project

Mr. Masterson and Mr. Cyburt:

Please be advised that a survey has been conducted on the above referenced project. It has been determined that cultural resources are not present on this property. The project has been plotted on the attached U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic map for your information (Figure 1, Regional Location).

County: Riverside

USGS 7.5' Quad: Perris; **Date:** 2022

Section: 11; **Township:** 5S; **Range:** 03W; **Land Grant:** N/A

Address: South of Ellis Avenue between Goetz Road and Case Road

City: Perris; **State:** California

Other Locational Data: From Interstate 215 take exit 15 for State Route 74 East and continue for 0.3 mile. Take Case Road and continue for 3.5 miles. Turn left onto Goetz Road and continue to Ellis Avenue. The northern boundary of the project site is east of Goetz Road and south of Ellis Avenue.

Assessor Parcel Number(s): 330-090-031, -033, -034, -036, -038, -040, and 330-100-031

UTMs: NAD 83 UTM Zone 11, 11N 3736529N, 479575E

Owner and Address: Chase Furr, Crow Holdings Capital
CH Realty – IX-MC I Riverside Perris Airport, L.P., A Delaware Limited
Partnership
3819 Maple Avenue
Dallas, TX 75219

Survey Type: Intensive Pedestrian/Phase I

Date of Survey: April 29, 2022, and January 27, 2023

Field Crew: Robert Bolger, RPA

BACKGROUND

Environmental

The proposed Perris Valley Industrial Project (project) site is south of Ellis Road between Goetz Road and Case Road (Figure 1, Regional Location). Except for a 9.79-acre fenced and graded construction yard, the 87.43-acre project site is completely undeveloped (Figure 2, Project Site). The project would include the development of an approximately 742,560-square-foot industrial distribution facility with associated landscaping and parking for automobiles and trailers on the western site and a trailer parking/storage lot with a guard shack on the eastern site.

The project site consists of undeveloped (fallow) farmland surrounding the northern half of the Perris Valley Airport and of a single fenced and graded construction equipment yard west of the airport. The project site is bounded by Goetz Road to the west, Ellis Avenue to the north, and Case Road to the east. Surrounding land uses include residential, commercial, industrial, and undeveloped lands to the west; undeveloped lands and storage to the north; undeveloped lands, commercial, and industrial to the east; and undeveloped and commercial to the south. The western portion of the project site has a dirt road around the perimeter of the undeveloped portion of the project. The Perris Valley Airport runway bisects the eastern and western portions of the survey area.

Historical aerials were reviewed from 1966 through 2018. The project site was initially undeveloped (1966) then was in agricultural use (1967). Prior to 1978, the property was fallowed, and no development has occurred on site until 2009 when the southwestern portion was developed with modular offices, parking, and storage. Since that time, the majority of the project site has remained fallowed and undeveloped. The project site is located within the 7.5-Minute Perris Quadrangle, Township 05 South, Range 03 West, Section 11.

The cultural investigation described in this letter report was implemented to support the City of Perris's (City's) responsibilities under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to incur no significant impacts to cultural resources resulting from the project.

Cultural Setting

Cultural resources are found throughout the City of Perris and are reminders of the City's prehistoric and historical record. Cultural resources are the tangible or intangible remains or traces left by past people who inhabited the region. They encompass both the built and the archaeological environments, as well as Traditional Cultural Properties. They are typically in protected areas near water sources and multiple ecoregions and can include Traditional Cultural Places, such as gathering areas, landmarks, and ethnographic locations.

Prehistoric

Numerous cultural chronologies are used when describing the prehistory and history of Riverside County and includes Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984, Grenda 1993, Goldberg 2001, Horne and McDougall 2008, Moratto 1984, Keller and McCarthy 1989, McDonald et al. 1987, O'Connell et al. 1974, Taylor and Meighan 1978, Wallace 1955, and Warren 1984. Researchers have used different terms and timelines to define the chronology for the area. The following uses standard terminology for the different time periods and provides a brief cultural background for Riverside County.

Paleoindian Period (pre-5500 BC)

Native peoples of this period used multiple habitat zones; subsisted on a generalized hunting, gathering, and collecting adaptation; and used a variety of resources (plant, animal, and mineral) (Erlandson and Colten 1991; Moratto 1984; Moss and Erlandson 1995). This period is associated with the terminus of the late Pleistocene (12,000 to 10,000 years before present) (Garrison and Smith 2021). The native peoples have been described as an early nomadic, hunting culture whose settlements were located on mesas and ridge tops and in deserts (Erlandson and Colton 1991; Rogers 1966; Wallace 1978; Warren et al. 1961). During this period, inhabitants relied on large game for subsistence (Rogers 1966; Warren et al. 1961) and produced “finely worked blades, spear points, choppers, and scrapers out of fine-grained volcanics” (Carrico 1977). In addition, leaf-shaped knives, foliate to ovoid bifaces, foliate to short-bladed shoulder points, crescents, engraving tools, core hammers, pebble hammers, and cores were part of the tool assemblage (Moratto 1984; Wahoff and Dolan 2000). Pottery and milling stones were missing from the assemblage, confirming the assumption that hunting was an economic focus for the culture (Moriarty 1967; Warren and True 1961). Because the tool assemblage was similar to desert cultures of the Mojave Desert, it is believed that this culture migrated west from the desert into California (Gallegos 1995; Rogers 1939). However, no single hypothesis is universally accepted. Other hypotheses identify the movement of people into California from the south and north down the coast (Taylor and Meighan 1978; Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984).

Archaic Period (8000 BC–AD 500)

The Archaic period began between 9,000 and 8,000 years before present, likely by the end of the last ice age and the stabilizing of temperatures and sea levels throughout the world (Garrison and Smith 2021). The Riverside area would have seen rising median temperatures and humidity and the final extinction of many of the megafaunal species that had been the focus of Paleoindian hunting attempts. Because of these environmental shifts, a dramatic shift in artifact assemblages and presumed lifeways occurs during the Archaic period.

In Southern California, the Archaic period (Encinitas Tradition, Millingstone Horizon, Pauma Complex, La Jolla Complex, and Greven Knoll Complex) focused on local resources. Inland groups gathered plants and seeds, while coastal groups relied primarily on shellfish. This period is characterized by the presence of dart points, milling equipment, scattered hearths, shell middens, and flexed burials (Carrico 1977). Subsistence strategies placed an emphasis on gathering, possibly as a result of environmental change (Wahoff and Dolan 2000; Wallace 1978). The most significant change noted in the artifact assemblage is an increased use of, and reliance on portable milling tools to process acorns, seeds, berries, nuts, and small animals. These portable metates and associated manos (or handstones) indicate a shift in subsistence strategies to seasonal plant resources and with it, an assumed shift to a slightly less nomadic lifestyle, with seasonal camps revisited annually based on the timing of local flora resources. The tool assemblage was composed of milling implements and cobble/core-based tools. The flaked tools do not appear to be as refined as those of the Paleoindian period. Mortuary goods included shell beads and ornaments, projectile points, and milling implements. Wallace (1978) interpreted archaeological sites of this period as an indication of an increase in population and permanence. Site types included coastal shell habitation bases, quarries, resource exploitation, and milling (Gallegos 1995). The sites are typified by an abundance of shellfish remains and are situated near sloughs and lagoons and on the open coast (Carrico 1977; Masters and Gallegos 1997; Moratto 1984; Wallace 1978). An inland

manifestation identified as the Pauma Complex/Greven Knoll Complex is known to have existed (Sutton and Gardner 2010; True 1958). Unlike the coastal people, this complex occupied valleys and sheltered canyons, had an emphasis on hunting and gathering, had a greater diversity of tool types, and lacked shellfish remains (Masters and Gallegos 1997:12). According to Sutton (2011), although large game was still hunted, plant-based resources became the primary dietary staple.

Late Prehistoric Period (500–1769 AD)

The Late Prehistoric period is an antecedent to Spanish contact. It was a “time of cultural transformations brought about by trait diffusion, immigration, and *in-situ* adaptation to environmental changes” (Moratto 1984:153). The Gabrieleño, Cahuilla, and Luiseño are known to have occupied Riverside County, and the Luiseño occupied the area that is the City of Perris. The San Luis Rey Complex that is the precursor to the ethnographic Luiseño was first identified by Meighan (1954). Subsistence strategies involved a focus on terrestrial collection and hunting (Christenson 1992); however, shellfish and other maritime resources were also used. Settlements included large villages in sheltered areas near permanent water sources, temporary campsites, quarries, and resource exploitation sites. Small triangular points, pottery, and Obsidian Butte obsidian are characteristic of this period (Christenson 1992; Masters and Gallegos 1997; True 1966). Cremations replaced flexed inhumations, and mortuary goods became more elaborate (Wallace 1955). Cremations are believed to have been introduced into the area during the Late Prehistoric period and are the result of Shoshonean intrusion (1500 BP) from the deserts (True 1966).

This period is marked by the introduction of ceramics (originally brownware but also later buffware technologies), the bow and arrow (which introduces the arrowhead to the Riverside archaeological record for the first time), and more expedited and simpler flaked-lithic traditions. This period also sees a large expansion in the use of local plant resources and the associated milling implements needed to process these resources.

The focus on local plant resources and adoption of technologies brought to the area led to a large population expansion. The rise of large, camps/small villages that were occupied by multiple smaller bands for weeks at a time on a seasonal basis became standard practice. The influence of the Late Prehistoric transition is emphasized by the fact that five of the six reported native groups present in Riverside at the time of European contact were all Shoshonean speakers with toolkits that still included the ceramics, bows and arrows, metates, and cremation practices from the time of the Late Prehistoric transition, indicating a lasting change that influenced the region for over a millennium.

Ethnohistoric Period (post-AD 1769)

The Ethnohistoric period begins with the first permanent European settlements. For Riverside County, six Native American groups lived in Riverside during the Ethnohistoric period. These groups include the Cahuilla, Gabrieleño, Serrano, Luiseño, Chemehuevi, and Mojave tribes (the Mojave being the only Yuman speaking group among the otherwise Shoshonean-speaking groups).

The Luiseño and Gabrieleño occupied the western end of what is now Riverside County, with the Luiseño occupying the southwestern ends of the County and the Gabrieleño occupying the northwest areas. Both groups extending west beyond present-day Riverside County and to the coast. The Cahuilla and Serrano occupied the central areas of the County, with the Cahuilla occupying the southern portion of the County, and the Serrano the northern portion. The Chemehuevi, the southernmost of the Paiute

groups, occupied what is now the northeastern areas of the County, while the farthest eastern stretches of the present-day County were occupied by the westernmost branches of the Mojave Peoples.

The Perris Valley area is recognized as a part of the traditional homeland of the Luiseño whose territory extended from Escondido and Oceanside in San Diego County to Riverside County. The leading sources on Luiseño culture and history are Kroeber (1976), Strong (1929), Bean and Shipek (1978), and True (1966).

According to Bean and Shipek (1978), the Luiseño (1) maintained a permanent camp or village on the valley floor and another in the mountainous regions for acorn collection, and villages were located in sheltered canyons or near year-round resources; (2) exploited resources in a highly developed seasonal mobility system; (3) collected seeds, roots, wild berries, acorns, wild grapes, strawberries, wild onions, and prickly pear cacti and hunted deer, elk, antelope, rabbit, wood rat, and a variety of insects; (4) used bows and arrows, atlatls or spear throwers, rabbit sticks, traps, nets, clubs, and slings as their main hunting tools; and (5) for each lineage, had exclusive hunting and gathering rights in their procurement ranges. These boundaries were respected and only crossed with permission.

When not prevented from doing so by Europeans or their diseases, native groups in the Ethnohistoric period carried on their lifeways from the Late Prehistoric period, including a heavy reliance on traditional food acquisition. Similar to the Late Prehistoric, native settlements in the Ethnohistoric period usually centered near permanent water sources and food resources, such as oak trees and lake and river aquatic resources.

Historical Period (post-AD 1542)

The Historical period can be divided into three phases (Spanish, Mexican, and American). Each phase is identified with a change in political power. Common goals in each phase included land gain, assimilation of the native population, and the attainment of wealth. However, these periods were dissimilar in the rationale behind these goals. Rationale included defense (Spain), independence and secularization (Mexico), and expansion and economics (United States). Assimilation of Native Californians was a desire of each government that came to power; however, the greatest misfortune of this period was the large decline in Native American populations (Phillips 1981).

Spanish Period (AD 1769–1821)

In California, the first Spanish contact occurred in 1542; however, it was not until 1769 that the first permanent settlement was established (San Diego). The Spanish period in Riverside County was ushered in by Anza's first expedition passing through in 1772–1774 (Beck and Haase 1974). This was a time of European expansionism and is typically identified with the mission system. However, European settlement in the region did not occur until the beginning of the 19th century (Tang and Hogan 2020). Presidios (military defense) and pueblos (city government) played an important role in the structuring of the community (Campbell 1977). The mission system was the institution designated for the assimilation and exploitation of native people (Campbell 1977; Jackson and Castillo 1995; Phillips 1981). Jackson and Castillo (1995:6) identified this exploitation as an extension of the "sixteenth-century policy of *congregacion/reduction*." In contrast, Costo (1987) noted that the transference of the Spanish Inquisition (originally established in 1478) to the New World that was the mechanism for this exploitation because the Inquisition

contained economic and religious incentives. The Spanish stronghold in California declined with Spain's loss of the Napoleonic Wars (1803–1815), which eliminated funding to the missions.

After the American annexation of Alta California, the large number of non-native settlers further eroded the foundation of traditional Luiseño society. During the latter half of the 19th century, almost all of the remaining Luiseño villages were displaced, their occupants eventually removed to the various reservations. Today, the nearest Native American groups of Luiseño heritage live on the Soboba, Pechanga, and Pala Indian Reservations.

Mexican Period (AD 1821–1859)

Mexican independence from Spain occurred in 1821, and in 1833, Mexico secularized the missions. After secularization, large tracts of land were granted to private citizens. “The secularization of the missions during the Mexican period is usually regarded as a watershed in California History because it resulted in the replacement of one Hispanic institution by another – the rancho for the mission” (Phillips 1981:33). Like the mission, the rancho became the institution of native exploitation. This period experienced an increase in cattle ranching and the hide and tallow trade (Gallegos 1995; Wahoff and Dolan 2000). In 1838, Juan Bandini was the recipient of a Mexican land grant that became Rancho Jurupa, a 40,000+ acre tract of land in what is now Riverside County that was so large and impactful to the local area that many modern roads and boundaries in modern Riverside County owe their location to the early 19th century Rancho. Meanwhile, in 1846, Miguel Pedrorena was granted the Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero, which includes much of the Moreno Valley. These ranchos were the centers of both home life and business during the Mexican period and helped expand cattle ranching into the main form of enterprise in the region during the 19th century. The passage of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo that ended the Mexican American War in 1848 was the final event that culminated the Mexican period in California.

American Period (Post-AD 1850)

The concept of a two-ocean economy and the California Gold Rush were the impetus that brought about the annexation of California (1850) to the United States. A large number of immigrants entered California with the discovery of gold and the availability of free land with the passage of the Homestead Act (1863). This population increase caused the displacement of Native Californians and brought about a deterioration in their rituals and traditions (Carrico 1986; Gallegos 1995). During this period, the ranchos experienced a decline primarily in response to their inability to validate land ownership as a result of the California Land Claims Act of 1851. “With the discovery of gold, the building of the transcontinental railroad, and the development of crops and cities, people in massive numbers from all parts of the world began to inhabit the region” (Phillips 1981: editors’ introduction).

In the 1870s, the importation of Brazilian navel oranges created a booming agricultural economy in the area, with orchards quickly taking over many of the fertile rolling hills. This orange-based economy continued to be a major feature of areas of western Riverside County for over a century.

In 1892, the U.S. Bureau of Indian Education and the Bureau of Indian Affairs jointly opened the Perris Indian School. The school was the first off-reservation native boarding facility geared toward “assimilating” natives from around the country, and many of the native children brought

there were forced against their will. The school changed its name during its move to the City of Riverside in 1903 to The Sherman Institute. Currently, the school is still in use under the name Sherman Indian High School.

Two years after the founding of the Perris Indian School, in 1894, the County of Riverside itself was formed out of land from surrounding counties. The new county took its name from the area's proximity to the Santa Ana River and now boasts over 125 years of official Riverside County history to go along with its prehistory.

The City of Perris was settled by the European Americans in the 1880s when gold was discovered in the area by Spanish and Mexican miners. The arrival of the railroad led to the founding of the city that was named for Fred T. Perris (Gunther 1984), who was the chief engineer of the California Southern Railroad. The railroad was established to connect the present-day cities of Barstow and San Diego.

The California Southern Railroad purchased the land from Southern Pacific Railroad in the Pinacate area for a town site. However, due to a land dispute at Pinacate, most of the citizens relocated 2 miles north of the railroad and established Perris in 1885.

The Perris station came online in April 1886, and by 1887, six passenger trains and two freight trains stopped at Perris daily. As a result, rapid growth occurred for several years. However, after storms repeatedly washed out the tracks in the Temecula Gorge, service to San Diego through this route ended (citytowninfo.com 2020).

Perris officially incorporated as a city in 1911. It was originally in San Diego County, but in 1892, it was transferred to Riverside County. Farming has been characteristic of Perris since its establishment in the 1880s. Many settlers moved to Perris on the advice of their physicians for the purpose of improving their health (perrisvalleyhistoricalmuseum.com). When water was imported to the area in the 1950s, greater agricultural production was realized (citytowninfo.com 2020; perrisvalleyhistoricalmuseum.com 2022). Perris generally remained agricultural throughout the 20th century; however, in recent years, the City has seen a growth in residential and industrial development, including large logistics centers and warehouses (Garrison and Smith 2021).

METHODS, REGULATORY SETTING, ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Description

The project proposes to develop an approximately 705,000-square-foot industrial building. Dock-high doors will be constructed along the eastern wall of the proposed building. The proposed building is expected to be surrounded by asphaltic concrete pavements in the parking and drive areas, Portland cement concrete pavements in the loading dock area, and concrete flatwork and landscaped planters throughout the site. Detailed structural information has not been provided.

Prior Research

Staff conducted a records search of the surrounding area using the California Historic Resources Inventory System (CHRIS) (Confidential Appendix B, CHRIS Background Data). Eleven studies

(Table 1, Previous Studies within a 0.25-Mile Radius) have been conducted within a 0.25-mile radius, and two sites (Table 2, Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within a 0.25-Mile Radius) were previously recorded. Of the previously recorded sites, one is prehistoric (CA-RIV-000805/P-33-000805), and one is historic (CA-RIV-8196/P-33-015743). None of these resources are located on the project site.

Table 1. Previous Studies within a 0.25-Mile Radius

Report ID	Title	Author	Year
RI-00146	Archaeological Impact Evaluation: Eastern Water District, Sewage Pipeline, Maripose Avenue to Existing Reclamation Facility, Sun City	Joan R. Smith	1974
RI-02084	Negative Archaeological Survey Report: Route 215, P.M. 27.4/33.7	S.R. Hammond	1987
RI-02245	Letter Report: Archaeological Reconnaissance - Perris, California	Paul Bowey	1987
RI-02777	Archival Records Search and Cultural Resources Survey of Perris Property Partners Property, Riverside County, California	Phillip de Barros	1988
RI-05361	Cultural Resources Survey for the Perris 50 Project, Riverside County, California	Roger D. Mason	2004
RI-07131	Archaeological Survey Report for Southern California Edison Company: Removal of Two Poles (#1667999E and #1668000E) on Idle Facility Project on the Deacon 12kV Circuit, Riverside County, California (WO#6077-6900, AI#P7988)	Stacey C. Jordan	2007
RI-07492	Archaeological Survey Report for Southern California Edison Company O&M - Global Plastics Project on the Deacon 12 kV Circuit, Riverside County, California	Koji Tsunoda and Michael M. DeGiovine	2007
RI-08771	Preliminary Historical/Archaeological Resource Study Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) Perris Valley Line Positive Train Control (PTC) Project In and near the Cities of Riverside, Perris, and Menifee Riverside County, California CRM TECH Contract No. 2444	Bai 'Tom' Tang	2010
RI-08980	Final: Cultural Resources Inventory Of The Proposed DPV2 Construction Yards Riverside County California	Scott C. Justus, Matthew M. DeCarlo, and William T. Eckhardt	2010
RI-09791	A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Biogas Service Pipeline Project, Perris, California	Brian F. Smith and Elena C. Goralogia	2016
RI-10461	Archaeological Investigations and Monitoring for the Construction of the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Line Project, Riverside County, California	William T. Eckhardt, Matthew M. DeCarlo, Doug Mengers, Sherri Andrews, Don Laylander, and Tony Quach	2015

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within a 0.25-Mile Radius

Primary Number	Trinomial	Chronological Placement	Site Type	Size
P-33-000805	CA-RIV-000805	Prehistoric	Lithic Scatter	18x46 feet
P-33-015743	CA-RIV-008196	Historic	Railroad	1030 feet

Historical Maps and Aerial Photographs Review

Historical maps and aerial photographs were reviewed to determine changes on the project site over time. The earliest aerial photograph is from 1966 and displays the project site as completely undeveloped. In 1967, the majority of the project site was in agriculture, which was followed by 1978. At that time, the airport runway that bisects the project site is present. No changes to the project site have occurred since 1978 (NETR Online 2022).

Applicable Regulations

Cultural resource regulations that apply to the project site are CEQA, the California Health and Safety Code, provisions of the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and the City of Perris General Plan (City of Perris 2022). Historic and archaeological districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects are assigned significance based on their exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the City of Perris in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. A number of criteria are used in demonstrating resource importance.

State Level Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act

According to CEQA, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR (California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1; 14 CCR 4852) including the following:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The fact that a resource is not listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1[k] of the California Public Resources Code), or not identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1[g] of the CEQA Guidelines) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in California Public Resources Code, Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

California Register of Historical Resources (California Public Resources Code, Section 5020 et seq.)

In California, the term “historical resource” includes but is not limited to “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California” (California Public Resources Code, Section 5020.1[j]). In 1992, the California legislature established the CRHR “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1[a]). A resource is eligible for listing in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission

determines that it is a significant resource and that it meets any of the following National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria (California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1[c]):

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
2. Associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Resources less than 50 years old are not considered for listing in the CRHR but may be considered if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand the historical importance of the resources (see 14 CCR 4852[d][2]).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historical resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing on the NRHP are automatically listed on the CRHR, as are the state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys. The State Historic Preservation Officer maintains the CRHR.

California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods, regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, requires that, if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the county coroner has examined the remains (Section 7050.5b). If the coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, the coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours (Section 7050.5c). The NAHC will notify the most likely descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner, the MLD may inspect the site of discovery. The inspection must be completed within 24 hours of notification of the MLD by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans.

City of Perris

General Plan – Conservation Element

Goal IV

Cultural Resources, Protection of historical, archaeological and paleontological sites.

Policy IV.A

Comply with state and federal regulations and ensure preservation of the significant historical, archaeological and paleontological resources.

Implementation Measures

IV.A.1 – For all private and public projects involving new construction, substantial grading, or demolition, including infrastructure and other public service facilities, staff shall require appropriate surveys and necessary site investigations in conjunction with the earliest environmental document prepared for a project.

IV.A.2 – For all projects subject to CEQA, applicants will be required to submit results of an archaeological records search request through the Eastern Information Center, at the University of California, Riverside.

IV.A.3 – Require Phase I Surveys for all projects located in areas that have not previously been surveyed for archaeological or historic resources, or which lie near areas where archaeological and/or historic sites have been recorded.

IV.A.4 – In Area 1 and Area 2 shown on the Paleontological Sensitivity Map, paleontologic monitoring of all projects requiring subsurface excavations will be required once any excavation begins. In Areas 4 and 5, paleontologic monitoring will be required once subsurface excavations reach five feet in depth, with monitoring levels reduced if appropriate, at the discretion of a certified Project Paleontologist.

IV.A.5 – Identify and collect previous surveys of cultural resources. Evaluate such resource and consider preparation of a comprehensive citywide inventory of cultural resources including both prehistoric sites and man-made resources.

IV.A.6 – Create an archive for the City wherein all surveys, collections, records and reports can be centrally located.

IV.A.7 – Strengthen efforts and coordinate the management of cultural resources with other agencies and private organizations.

Native American Traditional Cultural Properties

Native American Heritage Values

Federal and state laws mandate that consideration be given to the concerns of contemporary Native Americans with regard to potentially ancestral human remains, associated funerary objects, and items of cultural patrimony. Consequently, an important element in assessing the significance of the study site has been to evaluate the likelihood that these classes of items are present in areas that would be affected by the proposed project.

Also potentially relevant to prehistoric archaeological sites is the category termed Traditional Cultural Properties in discussions of cultural resources management performed under federal auspices. According to Patricia L. Parker and Thomas F. King (1998), “Traditional” in this context refers to those beliefs, customs, and practices of a living community of people that have been passed down through the generations, usually orally or through practice. The traditional cultural significance of a historic property, then, is significance derived from the role the property plays in a community’s historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices. Examples of properties possessing such significance include the following:

1. A location associated with the traditional beliefs of a Native American group about its origins, its cultural history, or the nature of the world;
2. A rural community whose organization, buildings and structures, or patterns of land use reflect the cultural traditions valued by its long-term residents;
3. An urban neighborhood that is the traditional home of a particular cultural group, and that reflects its beliefs and practices;
4. A location where Native American religious practitioners have historically gone, and are known or thought to go today, to perform ceremonial activities in accordance with traditional cultural rules of practice; and
5. A location where a community has traditionally carried out economic, artistic, or other cultural practices important in maintaining its historic identity.

A Traditional Cultural Property, then, can be defined generally as one that is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community's history and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.

Methodology

The goal of this survey was to provide a constraints-level survey to assess the project site for the presence of prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and the historic built environment. Robert Bolger, RPA, Harris & Associates archaeologist, conducted the first survey on April 29, 2022, covering all undeveloped parcels of the project. The field survey was conducted using standard archaeological procedures and techniques. The survey area included the entire project site including off-site improvements except for the 9.79-acre fenced and graded lot in the project's southwestern portion that was surveyed on January 27, 2023 (see discussion below for supplemental survey). Continuous parallel transects (15-meter) were walked primarily in a north-south direction. Transect intervals were started on the western portion of the survey area, along the western edge and moving east.

Visibility was generally good; however, some areas of vegetative growth impaired surface visibility. The survey area was bisected by the Perris Valley Airport runway, which was actively used for takeoff and landing throughout the survey time frame. As such, for safety reasons, the areas directly next to the active runway were surveyed from a distance of approximately 15–20 meters.

The survey area was found to be heavily plowed and utilized for agricultural purposes, although there are signs that the fields have been fallow in recent years. Because of what appeared to be very extensive plowing, it was assumed that any cultural resources present before agricultural activities took place are likely either destroyed or obscured. (See Photographs 1–5 for existing conditions.) No cultural resources were discovered, and most of the survey area lacked rocks bigger than a golf ball, a sign of extensive plowing activity. A few scattered and culturally unmodified cobbles of quartz and granitic were discovered in the northeastern portion of the project area, but they appear associated with some dumping areas. The only evidence of any built environment is a small (approximately 4-foot-by-4-foot) visible portion of a concrete pad of undetermined size (because it is mostly now subsurface) in the very northeastern corner adjacent to the intersection of the nearby roads. The pad's location at a topographical low point and its apparent small size make it very unlikely to be part of a building's foundation and is likely

associated with agricultural activities, such as a pad for a water tank. As such, it was determined to be non-significant, and a determination was made that no cultural resources were visible within the survey area.

A second, supplemental, survey was carried out by Robert Bolger on January 27, 2023, covering the 9.79-acre fenced and graded lot in the project's southwestern portion (Photographs 6–8). The entire lot was found to have been impacted to such a degree to make it highly unlikely for any *in-situ* cultural resources to remain. The entire lot was found to have been significantly graded down (between 1/3 and 1 meter in depth), covered with imported gravel, and routinely dragged with a levelling bar and tractor since at least 2008. The only non-graded areas consisted of the very edges of the property, and even these soils likely represent a redeposited grading berm rather than *in-situ* soils. All structures on the parcel were found to be modern.

The survey area was photographed (Appendix A, Photographs) and mapped (Figures 1 and 2) to document the environmental setting.

Results

No cultural resources were identified during the survey of the project site. The project site has been impacted by historical agricultural activities and modern grading; as such, any cultural resources that may have been present are likely to have been destroyed.

Native American Consultation

The California NAHC maintains the confidential Sacred Lands File (SLF), which contains sites of traditional, cultural, or religious value to Native Americans. The NAHC was contacted for a Sacred Lands File check to determine whether sacred lands are present on site (Confidential Appendix C, Sacred Lands File Check). The NAHC response was positive. Tribal notification pursuant to AB-52 was initiated on June 7, 2022, by the City of Perris. Two tribes responded (Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians (Agua Caliente) and the Pechanga Band of Indians (Pechanga)).

Agua Caliente initially requested a copy of the cultural study including the records search, but consultation was not requested at that time. A follow-up letter from Agua Caliente requested consultation. The City provided a copy of the cultural report to Agua Caliente on May 22, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The City followed up on January 17, 2024, inquiring whether they would like to consult.

Pechanga responded requesting consultation; however, the response was submitted on July 15, 2022, which was after the deadline (July 7, 2022). The City conducted consultation with Pechanga on August 17, 2022. Pechanga identified that there is a high probability for the presence of resources since VIP Industrial and line b identified resources. They requested a follow-up consultation. City staff provided the CEQA status and cultural report status at the consultation. The City provided a copy of the cultural report to Pechanga on May 22, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The City followed up on January 17, 2024, inquiring whether they would like to consult further.

Recommendations

The results of the survey were negative. The project site has been impacted by agricultural and grading activities, and any cultural resources that may have been present are likely to have been destroyed. Therefore, no further work, including monitoring, is recommended.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (619) 236-1778.

Sincerely,



DONNA BEDDOW, RPA
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments

- Figure 1 – Regional Location
- Figure 2 – Project Site
- Appendix A – Photographs
- Confidential Appendices – Under Separate Cover
 - Appendix B – CHRIS Background Data
 - Appendix C – Sacred Lands File Check

Bibliography

- Carrico, Richard L. 1977. Archaeological/Historical Survey of the Oaks North Villa PRD/Bernardo Trails No. 5 Projects. Unpublished manuscript on file at the South Coastal Information Center.
- Shipek, F.C. 1993. Kumeyaay Plant Husbandry: Fire Water, and Erosion Management Systems. In *Before the Wilderness: Native American Environmental Management*. Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson, eds. Menlo Park: Ballena Press. 78–388.
- Bean, Lowell John, and Florence C. Shipek. 1978. Luiseño. In Robert F. Heizer (ed.): *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8: California; pp. 550–563. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Beck, Warren A., and Ynez D. Haase. 1974. *Historical Atlas of California*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Campbell, Leon G. 1977. The Spanish Presidio in Alta California during the Mission Period 1769–1784. *Journal of the West* 16(4):63–77.
- Carrico, Richard L. 1977. Archaeological/Historical Survey of the Oaks North Villa PRD/Bernardo Trails No. 5 Projects. Unpublished manuscript on file at the South Coastal Information Center.
- Carrico, Richard L. 1986. “Before the Strangers: American Indians in San Diego at the Dawn of Contact.” In *The Impact of European Exploration and Settlement on Local Native Americans*. San Diego: Cabrillo Historical Association. 5–12.

- Chartkoff, Joseph L., and Kerry Kona Chartkoff. 1984. *The Archaeology of California*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Christenson, Lynne E. 1992. The Late Prehistoric Yuman Settlement and Subsistence System: Coastal Adaptation. In *Essays on the Prehistory of Maritime California*. Terry L. Jones, ed. Davis: University of California, Davis, Center for Archaeological Research. 217–230.
- City of Perris. 2022. General Plan, Conservation Element. Accessed June 2022.
<https://www.cityofperris.org/departments/development-services/general-plan>.
- CityTownInfo.com. 2020. Perris, California – Perris History. Accessed June 2022.
<https://www.citytowninfo.com/places/california/perris.com>.
- Costo, Jeanette Henry. 1987. The Sword and the Cross: The Missions of California. In *The Missions of California: A Legacy of Genocide*. Rupert Costo and Jeanette Henry Costo, eds. San Francisco: Indian Historian Press. 49–66.
- Erlandson, Jon M., and Roger H. Colton. 1991. An Archaeological Context for Early Holocene Studies on the California Coast. In *Hunter-Gatherers of the Early Holocene Coastal California*. Jon M. Erlandson and Roger H. Colton, eds. Los Angeles: University of California Los Angeles, Institute of Archaeology. 1–10.
- Gallegos, Dennis. 1995. Cultural Resource Phase I Boundary Test for the Jamul Shopping Center Project. Unpublished manuscript on file at the County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services.
- Garrison, Andrew J., and Brian F. Smith. 2021. A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Stratford Ranch Project, Perris, California. Unpublished manuscript on file at the City of Perris, Planning Department.
- Goldberg, Susan K. (ed.). 2001. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Eastside Reservoir Project: Final Report of Archaeological Investigations. On file, Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.
- Grenda, Donn. 1993. Archaeological Treatment Plan for CA-RIV-2798/H, Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, California. On file, Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.
- Gunther, Jane Davies. 1984. *Riverside County, California, Place Names: Their Origins and Their Stories*.
- Horne, Melinda C., and Dennis P. McDougall. 2008. CA-RIV-6069: Early Archaic Settlement and Subsistence in the San Jacinto Valley, Western Riverside County, California. On file, Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.
- Jackson, Robert H., and Edward Castillo. 1995. *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization: The Impact of the Mission System on California Indians*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- Keller, Jean S., and Daniel F. McCarthy. 1989. Data Recovery at the Cole Canyon Site (CA-RIV-1139), Riverside County, California. *Pacific Coast Archeological Society Quarterly* 25.
- Kroeber, A.L. 1976. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Reprinted. Dover Editions, Dover Publications, Inc., New York. Originally published 1925, Bulletin No. 78, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Masters, Patricia M., and Dennis R. Gallegos. 1997. Environmental Change and Coastal Adaptations in San Diego County during the Middle Holocene. In *Archaeology of the California Coast during the Middle Holocene*. Jon Erlandson and Michael Glassow, eds. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, Institute of Archaeology. 11–22.
- McDonald, Meg, Philip J. Wilke, and Andrea Kauss. 1987. McCue: An Elko Site in Riverside County. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 9(1):46–73.
- Meighan, Clement W. 1954. A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10(2).
- Moratto, Michael. 1984. *California Archaeology*. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press.
- Moriarty, James R. 1967. “Transitional Pre-Desert Phase in San Diego County, California.” *Science* 155:553–556.
- Moss, M.L. and J. Erlandson. 1995. Reflections on North American Coast Prehistory. *Journal of World Prehistory* 9(1):1–46.
- NETR Online. 2022. Historic Aerials. Accessed June 2022. <http://www.historicaerials.com>.
- O’Connell, James F., Philip J. Wilke, Thomas F. King, and Carol L. Mix (eds.). 1974. *Perris Reservoir Archaeology: Late Prehistoric Demographic Change in Southeastern California*. On file, Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.
- Parker, Patricia L., and Thomas F. King. 1998. *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Register, History and Education, National Register of Historic Places. 1990, revised 1992.
- Perris Valley Historical Museum. 2022. “Perris Valley Historical Museum.” Accessed June 2022. perrisvalleyhistoricalmuseum.com.
- Phillips, George H. 1981. *The Enduring Struggle: Indians in California History*. San Francisco: Boyd and Fraser Publishing Company.
- Rogers, Malcolm. 1939. *San Diego Museum Papers No. 3*. San Diego: San Diego Museum of Man.
- Rogers, Malcolm. 1966. *Ancient Hunters of the Far West*. San Diego: Copley Press.
- Strong, William Duncan. 1929. Aboriginal Society in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 26(1).

- Sutton, Mark Q. 2011. The Palomar Tradition and Its Place in the Prehistory of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 44(4):1–74.
- Sutton, Mark Q. and Jill K. Gardener. 2010. Reconceptualizing the Encinitas Tradition of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 42(4):1–64.
- Tang, Bai “Tom,” and Michael Hogan. 2020. Cultural Resources Survey Report – Assessor’s Parcel Number 302-030-101, City of Perris, Riverside County, California. Unpublished manuscript on file at the City of Perris, Planning Department.
- Taylor, R.E., and Clement Meighan. 1978. *Chronologies in New World Archaeology*. New York: Academic Press.
- True, Delbert. L. 1958. An Early Complex in San Diego County, California. *American Antiquity* 23(3):255–263.
- True, Delbert. L. 1966. *Archaeological Differentiation of Shoshonean and Yuman Speaking Groups in Southern California*. PhD. diss. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Wahoff, Tanya, and Christy Dolan. 2000. Environmental Assessment for the Rincon San Luiseño Band of Mission Indians, Rincon Casino. Unpublished manuscript on file at the County of San Diego, Planning and Development Services.
- Wallace, William J. 1955. A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11:214–230.
- Wallace, William J. 1978. Post-Pleistocene Archaeology, 9000–2000 B.C. In *Handbook of North American Indians*. Vol. 8. Robert F. Heizer, ed. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution. 25–36.
- Warren, Claude N. 1984. The Desert Region. In Michael J. Moratto (ed.): *California Archaeology*; pp. 339–430. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press,
- Warren, Claude N., and D.L. True. 1961. *UCLA Archaeological Annual Survey Reports, 1960–1961*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Warren, Claude N., D.L. True, and A. Eudy. 1961. “Early Gathering Complexes in Western San Diego County.” In *University of California, Los Angeles, Archaeological Annual Survey Reports, 1960–1961*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.

This page intentionally left blank.

Figure 1. Regional Location

Figure 2. Project Site

Appendix A. Photographs

This page intentionally left blank



Photograph 1: Survey area facing west.



Photograph 2: Survey area facing south.



Photograph 3: Survey area facing southwest toward the Perris Valley Airport.



Photograph 4: Survey area facing north.



Photograph 5: Survey area facing north.



Photograph 6: Survey area's fenced and graded equipment yard (facing east).



Photograph 7: Northeast corner of survey area's fenced and graded yard with elevation difference shown and margin areas of possibly ungraded land.



Photograph 8: Main structure within survey area's fenced and graded yard (facing west); no historic elements of structure.

